DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 190 JC 760 116

AUTHOR Lucas, John A.
TITLE Evaluation of Faculty Orientation--1975. Research Report Series, Vol. 7, No. 4.
INSTITUTION William Rainey Harper Coll., Palatine, Ill.
PUB DATE 10 Nov 75
NOTE 13p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Instructional Staff; *Junior Colleges; Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS William Rainey Harper College

ABSTRACT

In order to evaluate the four-day faculty orientation offered by William Rainey Harper College, a survey was sent to all 202 full-time faculty in the fall of 1975. Ninety-one completed evaluations were returned. About 50 percent of the faculty felt that the orientation was very beneficial and should be continued as is. In 1974, 71 percent felt this way. In both years about 19 percent felt it should be discontinued. The big difference between 1974 and 1975 was that more faculty in 1975 felt the orientation should be modified to shorten the formal orientation, allowing more time for individual preparation and committee work. About 42 percent of the faculty were prevented from attending all or part of the orientation because of other commitments. In 1974 about 20 percent had suggested meeting off campus. Although this suggestion was followed, only 34 percent of the respondents felt that it was worth the money. Thirty percent felt money would be better spent attracting top educational leaders as speakers. New faculty felt the mentors assigned to them and the new faculty meeting were very helpful. An outline of the orientation program is included, data are organized into tables, and the survey instrument is appended. (Author/NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118190

William Rainey Harper College

EVALUATION OF FACULTY ORIENTATION---1975

Research Report Series Volume VII, No. 4

November 10, 1975

Office of Planning and Research

John A. Lucas, Director

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 760 116

Evaluation of Faculty Orientation

In order to evaluate the Faculty Orientation held August 19-23, a survey (shown in the appendix) was sent to all 202 full-time faculty and after several weeks 91 completed evaluations were returned. The results can be summarized as follows:

(1) About 50 percent of the faculty felt this year's orientation was very beneficial and should be continued as is. Last year 71 percent of the faculty felt this way. In both years about 18-19 percent felt it should be discontinued. The big difference in the overall evaluation between this year and last year is that more faculty this year felt the orientation should be modified before continuing. The biggest group of suggestions centered around shortening the formal orientation allowing more time for individual preparation and committee work. When faculty were asked whether there was enough time devoted to individual planning preparations, 70 percent indicated there was not enough time.

(2) Theobald's sessions and the special committee meetings were rated as providing more benefit to the faculty than the other sessions offered. However, none of the sessions rated as high on the benefit scale as the top sessions on last year's program.

(3) About 42 percent of the faculty were prevented from attending all or part of the orientation because of other commitments. This is about the same as last year.

(4) This year 34 percent of the faculty felt it was worth the money to meet off campus. Last year about 20 percent had suggested meeting off campus. This year 30 percent felt money would be better spent attracting additional top educational leaders rather than meeting off campus while last year 35 percent were satisfied with using the money to attract a number of top educational leaders. In summary, it would be inferred over the last two year's experiences with faculty orientation, about a third of the faculty prefer to use the money to attract top educational leaders, about a third prefer to use the money to meet off campus and a third prefer to use the money in another way during the year.

(5) The new faculty felt the mentors assigned to them and the new faculty meeting were very helpful to them.

EVALUATION OF FACULTY ORIENTATION PROGRAM

Overall Evaluation	Number	Percent
It was very beneficial and should be continued	45	50.5
It was good but should be modified in a major way before continuing	28	31.5

	Number	Percent
Program too long-more individual preparation time needed	7	38.9
Need more small group sessions with experts in which group is effectively run	3	16.7
Make sure there are good leaders	1	5.6
Eliminate guest speakers	1	5.6
Return to informal setting of 1974	1	5.6
Hold on campus	1	5.6
Need more interaction between faculty and staff	1	5.6
Need more on Harper plans and facilities	1	5.6
Need more emphasis on improvement of instruction	1	5.6
This should only be for new faculty	1	5.6
	18	100.0

It has outlived its usefulness and should be discontinued	16	18.0
	89	100.0

Barriers to Participating in Orientation		
Nothing prevented faculty member from participating	49	58.3
Other responsibilities and commitments allowed only partial or no participation	35	41.7
	84	100.0

List of Responsibilities or Commitments Preventing Full Participation in Orientation	
Departmental duties, preparation and committee meetings	12
Student registration	4½
Counseling and academic advising	4
Medic[illegible] problems	3½
Pro[illegible] coordination duties-hiring-preparation	3
Adm[illegible]rative responsibilities	2
Pers[illegible] problems	1
	30

RATINGS OF GENERAL PRESENTATIONS AND DIALOGUE SESSIONS

Session	Overall Benefit to Faculty Members		Appropriateness and Interest in Subject Matter		Effectiveness of Leader		Degree of Interest Among Participants	
	Rating*	Number	Rating*	Number	Rating*	Number	Rating*	Number
Bob Theobald-Dialogue Session-New Perceptions-The Future of the Community College	3.27	55	3.84	55	3.59	54	3.39	54
Bob Theobald-Presentation-Creating America's Third Century, A Challenge to Community Colleges	3.25	76	3.90	79	3.83	78	2.94	67
Special Committee Meetings	3.11	18	3.47	17	3.24	17	3.31	16
Planning Strategies for Referendum Presentation by Guerin Fischer and Bill Mann	2.94	51	3.51	45	2.91	45	2.96	47
Support Systems for the Future Dialogue-Session - John Birkholz	2.90	39	3.34	41	3.31	39	2.68	38
Student Grievance Procedure - Concurrent Topical Session	2.88	17	3.56	18	2.89	19	3.18	11
Administrative Services - Dialogue Session - Bill Mann	2.81	27	3.66	35	3.00	34	2.88	24
The President Looks at the Future - Presentation Robert Lahti	2.79	72	3.55	76	3.06	77	2.51	63
Willow Park Center - Extension Center Operations - Concurrent Topical Session	2.79	19	3.39	18	2.87	15	2.88	16
Academic Affairs Reorganization - Concurrent Topical Session	2.76	25	3.16	25	3.12	25	2.55	22
New Campus Phone System - Concurrent Topical Session	2.71	28	3.32	28	2.62	29	2.36	22

*5= very high degree of interest, 4=high degree, 3=satisfactory, 2=neutral, 1=low degree of interest, effectiveness or value

Evaluation of Informal Coffee Session	Number	Percent
Was able to meet and chat sufficiently with old frients who I hadn't seen during summer	46	51.7
Was able to talk with individuals I never or seldom have ever talked with before	36	40.5
Was able to meet and chat with old friends but the time available for this was too short	12	13.5
Was able to talk with some of the workshop leaders in more depth after or before the sessions	5	5.6
The physical arrangements were terrible	3	3.4
There were many new people	2	2.3
No desire for this activity	1	1.1
Too busy for these type of sessions	1	1.1
	89	
Evaluation of Board Dinner		
It is a grand tradition and should be continued.	50	65.0
It is a good event but shouldn't be held during orientation.	13½	17.5
It should be modified	6½	8.4
Have a program-some other focus beside eating - 2½		
Reduce cost-cut down on choices and waste - 2		
Make it more informal - 1		
Arrange seating by department - 1		
It should be discontinued	7	9.1
	77	100.0
Evaluation of Game Activities		
I participated in same	19	20.9
I had too many other commitments and responsibilities to participate	39	42.9
I didn't feel those activities were appropriate for orientation	14	15.4
There were no activities in which I was interested	10	11.0
I wasn't sure who was participating or what was going on	5	5.5
More direction was needed	2	2.2
It was a good idea - just didn't get around to it	2	2.2
	91	100.0
Feelings About Board Member Participation in Faculty Orientation		
It is important for the faculty to have a time where they can interact with the Board members	43	48.3
It is important for Board members to see what educational issues are important to faculty	45	50.6
I don't care whether or not Board members participate	19	21.4
	89	
Feelings About Time Devoted to Divisional Meetings and Individual Planning		
Divisional Meetings		
Not enough time was available	22	26.8
About the right time was available	51	62.2
Too much time was allocated	9	11.0
	82	100.0

Other Comments About New Faculty Orientation

The planning for physicals was poor - should be done before semester begins.
New faculty meeting was especially helpful.
College policies should really be explained.

Faculty Interested in Serving on the Overall Planning Committee

G. J. Norini
Roger Bechtold
Roger Mussell
Judy Dincher
Chris Newkirk

Faculty Interested in Developing, Leading or Helping to Run a Workshop for Next Year's Faculty Orientation

	Topic or workshop
G. J. Norini	Competency based instruction
Roger Mussell	Skill level training programs
Richard Lockwood	Armageddon contingencies - relating on our work to the enormous world

Faculty Interested in Developing, Leading or Helping to Run a Special Event for Next Year's Faculty Orientation

Roy Kearns	Golf
Roger Mussell	Liberal studies application

APPENDIX

Evaluation of Faculty Orientation Program
Harper Looks to the Future

August 19-23, 1975
Harper College

1. What was your overall evaluation of Faculty Orientation this Fall? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. It was very beneficial and definitely should be continued next year.

_____ B. It was good but only should be continued after major modifications. Give some suggestions.

_____

_____

_____

_____ C. It has outlived its usefulness and should be discontinued.

_____ D. Other time of evalution (describe) _____

_____

2. Think of the presentations and the dialogue sessions and the specific times you attended and rate each session in which you participated on the following basis.

5=very high degree of interest
4=high degree
3=satisfactory level
2=neutral response
1=low degree of interest, effectiveness or value

Rate each session you attended on four different aspects by placing a number in each column opposite that session.

Presentations and Dialogue Sessions	Appropriateness and interest in Subject Matter	Effectiveness of Leader	Degree of Interaction Among Participants	Overall Workshop Benefit To You
Tuesday Presentations				
Creating America's Third Century, A Challenge to Community Colleges - Robert Theobald	_____	_____	_____	_____
The President Looks at the Future - Robert Lahti	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tuesday Dialogue Sessions				
New Perceptions - The Future of the Community College - Robert Theobald	_____	_____	_____	_____
Support Systems for the Future - John Birkholz	_____	_____	_____	_____
Administrative Services - William Mann	_____	_____	_____	_____
Wednesday Presentations				
Planning Strategies for Referendum - Guerin Fischer and William Mann	_____	_____	_____	_____
Wednesday Concurrent Topical Sessions				
New Campus Phone System	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Grievance Procedure	_____	_____	_____	_____
Willow Park Center Extension Center Operations	_____	_____	_____	_____
Academic Affairs Reorganization	_____	_____	_____	_____
Thursday				
Special Committee Meetings	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. List workshop topics you would like to see explored next year._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Would you be interested in participating in the planning or operations of next years Faculty Orientation?
Check (✓) those appropriate and list your name.

_____ A. I would be interested in serving on the overall planning committee.

_____ B. I would be interested in developing, leading or helping to run a workshop for next year's faculty orientation. Topic or workshop interested in_____

_____

_____ C. I would be intested in developing, leading or helping to run a special event for next year's faculty orientation. Describe special event_____

_____

(Name) _____

5. Did other responsibilities or commitments prevent you from attending part or all of the orientation.

_____ A. Yes

_____ B. No

If yes, describe the responsibilities or commitments and how much of the orientation program you missed because of this.

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. How would you describe the informal coffee sessions and other periods of time? Check (✓) all those appropriate.

_____ A. I was able to meet and chat sufficiently with old friends who I hadn't seen over the summer.
_____ B. I was able to meet and chat with old friends but the time available for this was too short.
_____ C. I was able to talk with individuals I never or seldom have ever talked with before. How many? _____
_____ D. I was able to talk with some of the workshop leaders in more depth after or before the sessions.
_____ E. Other descriptions _____

_____

_____

_____

7. How would you evaluate the Board Dinner? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. It is a grand tradition which should be continued.
_____ B. It is a good event but shouldn't be held during Faculty Orientation.
_____ C. It should be modified in the following way:

_____

_____

_____

_____ D. It should be discontinued.

8. How did you feel about the game activities offered on Tuesday afternoon. Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I participated in some.
_____ B. I had too many other commitments and responsibilities to participate.
_____ C. There were no activities in which I was interested.
_____ D. I wasn't sure who was participating or what was going on.
_____ E. I didn't feel they were appropriate for Orientation.
_____ F. Other (describe) _____

_____

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 12 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

9. How do you feel about Board member participation in Faculty Orientation? Check (✓) all those appropriate.

____ A. It is important for the faculty to have a time where they can interact with the Board members.
____ B. It is important for Board members to see what educational issues are important to Faculty.
____ C. I don't care whether Board members participate or not.
____ D. Other comments _____

_____

10. How do you feel about holding the orientation off campus?

____ A. It is well worth the money to hold the orientation in an off campus environment. The facilities were great.
____ B. The money would better be spent in attracting adidtional top educational leaders to campus.
____ C. The money would be better spent in another way. (Specify) _____

11. Did you feel there was enough time for divisional meetings and individual planning Check (✓) once in each column.

	Division Meetings	Individual Planning
Not enough time was available	_____	_____
About the right time was available	_____	_____
Too much time was allocated	_____	_____

12. Other comments about Faculty Orientation _____

_____

_____

FOR NEW FACULTY MEMBERS ONLY

13. Please rate each special program planned for new faculty by checking (✓) one column for each row.

	Very Meaningful	It was OK	Waste of time	Didn't Participate
Informal reception held on Monday, August 18	_____	_____	_____	_____
Experienced faculty member assigned to you	_____	_____	_____	_____
Thursday morning new faculty meeting	_____	_____	_____	_____

Any other comments about your reaction to orientation.

_____

_____